



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,515	01/30/2004	Bhanwar Singh	AMDP999US/H1920	6654
23623	7590	09/24/2009	EXAMINER	
TUROCY & WATSON, LLP			RUGGLES, JOHN S	
127 Public Square				
57th Floor, Key Tower				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/768,515	SINGH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John Ruggles	1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 08 September 2009 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a) ☐ entered.
- b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

- d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.
- e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

The proposed amendment under 37 CFR 1.312 filed on 9/8/09 (after allowance and one day before the issue fee payment on 9/9/09) includes newly added claims 24-35, which are now proposed for the first time. But, at least the newly proposed independent claim 27 includes an additional alternative for the distance between the mask and the substrate, which broadens the claim scope (as compared to that of previously allowed independent claim 1) and would require further consideration. In addition, Applicant fails to provide any sufficient reason for proposing these additional new claims after the close of an extensive prosecution history. See MPEP 714.16. Therefore, this proposed amendment is NOT entered.

/Mark F. Huff/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/John Ruggles/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795